



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,537	11/20/2003	Michael Jackson Hosey	50065.00011	3450

7590 03/21/2005  
Stuart Whittington, Esq.  
7037 E. Monte Circle  
Mesa, AZ 85208

EXAMINER

EVANS, ANDREA HENCE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/719,537	HOSEY, MICHAEL JACKSON	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Andrea H. Evans	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,6,12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Friedrich (1651804).

Referring to claim 1, Friedrich teaches a timepiece comprising: a casing (Figures 5 and 6); a display device (a) secured by the casing (See Column 1, page 1, lines 8-10); and an attachment section pivotally attached to the casing; (Figure 2, c); and wherein the attachment section is configured to be attachable to an object of interest (Page 1, Column 2, lines 63-65) and pivot in a position to maintain the display device in a substantially upright position when the attachment section is placed on a substantially horizontal surface (See Figure 2, Page 1, Column 2, lines 65-72).

Referring to claim 6, Friedrich teaches an attachable display apparatus comprising: a casing configured to hold an electronic device having a display (a), (See Figures 5 and 6); and an attachment section (b) coupled to the casing and configured to attach and detach with an object of interest (See Page 1, Column 2, lines 63-65); wherein the casing and the attachment section are coupled (b) such that they move with respect to each other and can be configured to lie essentially in the same plane to form a first configuration (when the watch is flat) and can be

Art Unit: 2854

configured to form an angle of ninety degrees or less between the attachment section and the casing section to form a second configuration (See Figure 2, Page 1, Column 2, lines 65-72).

Referring to claim 12, Friedrich teaches the apparatus further comprising a hinge section (b) configured to connect the attachment section with the casing in a pivoting manner (Figure 2).

Referring to claim 14, Friedrich teaches the apparatus wherein the second configuration maintains the display in an upright position while the attachment section is placed on a substantially horizontal surface (Figure 2).

3. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kauker et al (Des. 402104).

Referring to claim 16, Kauker teaches an electronic device (Figure 1) having a display (See Figure 1, Examiner 1); a casing configured to hold the electronic device (See Examiner 2); and a clip (Examiner 3) pivotally attached to the casing, the clip configured to be attachable to an object of interest, the clip configured to be pivoted to form a stand for the apparatus. Examiner notes that the clip can bend at the fabric.

Referring to claim 17, Kauker teaches the electronic device comprises a watch (See Figure 1).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2854

5. Claims 2,3,5,7,8,10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friedrich (1651804) in view of Kita (5481506).

Referring to claims 2 and 7, Friedrich teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Friedrich does not teach the display device comprises a watch module. Kita teaches a display device comprising a watch module (See Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Friedrich to include a watch module to display time in an accurate digital manner as taught by Kita.

Referring to claims 3 and 8, Friedrich teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Friedrich does not teach the watch module includes one or more modes selected from a group consisting of a time mode, an altimeter mode, a compass mode, a barometer mode, an alarm mode and a chronograph mode. Kita teaches a watch module that includes one or more modes selected from a time mode (4c) and a barometer mode (Figures 10 and 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Friedrich to include a watch module that includes one or more modes such as a time mode and a barometer mode to provide a watch that can display data as sensed as taught by Kita.

Referring to claims 5 and 10, Friedrich teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Friedrich does not teach a temperature sensor coupled to the watch module and wherein the display device is operable to display a temperature. Kita teaches a temperature sensor (9a) coupled to the watch module and wherein the display device (4a) is operable to display a temperature. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Friedrich to include a temperature sensor coupled to the watch

Art Unit: 2854

module and wherein the display device is operable to display a temperature so that the user can sense the temperature and view it as taught by Kita.

Referring to claim 11, Friedrich teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Friedrich does not teach the apparatus wherein the electronic device comprises one selected from a group consisting of a MP3 player, a multi-function display device, a cell phone, a personal digital assistant, a calculator and a digital camera. Kita teaches the electronic device comprises a multi-function display (See Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Friedrich such that it is a multi-function display device to provide a device which can display multi-functions to keep the user aware by sensors as taught by Kita.

6. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friedrich (1651804) in view of Cooper (6234668).

Referring to claims 4 and 9, Friedrich teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Friedrich does not teach that the attachment section comprises a carabiner clip. Cooper teaches an attachment section that comprises a carabiner clip (See Column 5, lines 58-63). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Friedrich to include a carabiner clip in the attachment section to help connect the base of the watch with a desired object as taught by Cooper.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friedrich (1651804) in view of Sekiguchi (6751164).

Referring to claim 13, Friedrich teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Friedrich does not teach that the electronic device includes a multi-function module configured to identify

Art Unit: 2854

and display an altitude, a temperature, a time, a date, and a compass heading. Sekiguchi teaches an electronic device that includes a multi-function module configured to identify and display an altitude, a temperature, a time, a date, and a compass heading (See Figure 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Friedrich such that the electronic device includes a multi-function module configured to identify and display an altitude, a temperature, a time, a date, and a compass heading so that a variety of information can be displayed under various assignments in a display mode as taught by Sekiguchi.

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friedrich (1651804) in view of Saitou et al (6765846).

Referring to claim 15, Friedrich teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Friedrich does not teach an electronic device is a radio communication device. Saitou teaches an electronic device is a radio communication device (See Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Friedrich such that the electronic device is a radio communication device to assure stable and reliable communications during conversation and waiting time as taught by Saitou.

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauker in view of Kita (5481506).

Referring to claim 18, Kauker teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Kauker does not teach the electronic device comprises an altimeter. Kita teaches the electronic device comprises an altimeter (Figures 10 and 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary

Art Unit: 2854

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kauker to include an altimeter to measure and display pressure readings as taught by Kita.

10. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauker in view of Kita (6619835).

Referring to claim 19, Kauker teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Kauker does not teach the electronic device comprises a personal audio device. Kita teaches an electronic device comprising a personal audio device (25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kauker to include a personal audio device so that the user can play music as taught by Kita.

11. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauker in view of Saitou et al (6765846).

Referring to claim 20, Kauker teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Kauker does not teach an electronic device is a radio communication device. Saitou teaches an electronic device is a radio communication device (See Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kauker such that the electronic device is a radio communication device to assure stable and reliable communications during conversation and waiting time as taught by Saitou.

12. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauker in view of Tsukamoto (6359837).

Referring to claim 21, Kauker teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Kauker does not teach an electronic device comprises a digital camera. Tsukamoto teaches an electronic device comprising a digital camera (See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having



Art Unit: 2854

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kauker such that the electronic device comprises a digital camera to capture images viewable on a watch as taught by Tsukamoto.

13. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauker in view of Heinsen et al (4158285).

Referring to claim 22, Kauker teaches all that is claimed as discussed above. Kauker does not teach an electronic device comprises a calculator. Heinsen teaches an electronic device that comprises a calculator (See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kauker such that the electronic device comprises a calculator so that the user can perform arithmetic functions as taught by Heinsen.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea H. Evans whose telephone number is (571) 272-2162. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday; 8:30a-5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrea H. Evans, ESQ

AHE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ren Yan", with a stylized, cursive script.

**REN YAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**